To cite this article: Robert Debski (2017). Language transmission opportunities created through video recording in the family: a microanalysis. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI:10.1080/13670050.2017.1311835.

Author's Original Manuscript (before peer reviews)

Abstract

The present study examines a family language transmission project in which a child, learning Polish in Australia, created video documentaries with her own voice annotations in Polish. The project generated numerous parent-child interactions at the time of videorecording, hypothesized to be conducive to language learning. The data in the study were seven voice-annotated video documentaries, made by the focal child. The qualitative microanalysis of the data consisted of repeated viewings and partial transcription of the data in order to identify any patterns in the parent-child interactions, gather evidence of language learning by the child and describe the role of the camera as a mediating tool. A sociocultural theory-based set of concepts was adopted to guide the analysis, which revealed several patterns in the data. Firstly, to bid for help from her parents, the child used a range of interactional strategies to which the parents responded using confirmations, prompts or providing language units. Secondly, the family project created an environment conducive to language learning by supporting the child's agency and helping her perform above her current language proficiency level. Finally, the video camera played a crucial role as a tool enabling the child's agency and creating opportunities for indicational language learning.

Keywords: bilingual children, language transmission, Polish community, parent-child collaborative interactions, agency, technological mediation

1. Introduction

The presence of community languages[1] in multicultural societies is regarded as an asset (Clyne 2005) and bilingualism is considered a phenomenon accruing many cognitive and affective advantages to bilingual individuals (Poulin-Dubois et al. 2011; Paradis, Genesee, and Crago 2011). Research also suggests that multilingual social groups are better informed and more democratic (Corsellis 2005) and they benefit from multilingualism economically (CILT/InterAct International 2007). Consequently, the maintenance of community languages by individuals and whole ethnic groups has received much attention in Australia, and understanding the conditions and processes governing multilingualism has been an object of scientific investigation. Sociolinguistic research thus far has produced a body of knowledge related to multilingualism resulting from community language maintenance on topics, such as the dynamics of group language maintenance and shift (Clyne 1991; Clyne and Kipp 2002; Rubino 2009), community language use in various interactional domains (Kouzmin 1988; Doucet 1991; Clyne 1991), structural changes in the community languages (Clyne 2003;

[1] Clyne (1991, 3) defines community languages as "languages other than English and Aboriginal languages employed within the Australian community". In his opinion, this term replaces the use of such terms as "foreign languages", "migrant languages" or "ethnic languages", which are discriminatory or unsuitable in the Australian situation.

Clyne et al. 2015), and the role of socio-cultural and psychological factors in community language maintenance (Smolicz 1981; Gibbons and Ramirez 2004).

The tendency to abandon using community languages that is observed in the second generation of immigrants (Clyne 2005) underscores the importance of language transmission in the multilingual family. The home environment is one of the traditional and most important domains where community languages are learned and used by the whole family. The role of family and especially parents in language transmission has been a subject of research. Available findings strongly highlight the match between parental attitudes concerning the community language and bilingualism and their children's language maintenance or shift (Cho 2008; Enstice 2012). Parents are positioned as a central force in devising their family language ideology and then implementing it (Clyne 2005; Schwartz 2010; Fogle and King 2013). Such policy may involve decisions about the model of language transmission that the family adopt, whether to engage children in bilingual education or the possible input and output opportunities in the target language that the family create for children (Clyne 2005, Schwartz 2010). On the other hand, research underscores the agency of the multilingual child, who can use a variety of resources to take control over the family language policy and parent-child interactions (Zhu 2008; Gyogi 2015). Language transmission research also stresses the importance of the quality of parent-child relations and the quality of community language input as factors determining success (Döpke 1993; Lambert 2008).

Our understanding of the mechanics of community language intergenerational transmission can be significantly enriched by fine-grained examination of parent-child interaction in various contexts of daily life. In a recent study conducted in Sweden, Kheirkhah and Cekaite (2015) demonstrate, for example, how language transmission opportunities were instantiated and negotiated by a multilingual family from Iran, transmitting Persian and Kurdish to their child. The researchers use their analysis of video recordings to examine and describe the everyday family interactions during meals and play. The study reveals a complex picture of language maintenance efforts, where the parents frequently shift their interactional concerns from meaning-making to language form through requests for translation and displays of non-understanding. The authors maintain in conclusion that, while being beneficial for the child's community language development, 'explicit' teaching strategies interrupted the conversational flow and led to the child's frequent resistance and refusal to interact in the community language. Lanza (2005) divides all interactional strategies used by parents to teach their children the community language into 'implicit' and 'explicit' strategies. The researcher, conversely to Kheirkhah and Cekaite (2015), expresses the view that explicit strategies, such as requests for translation or clarification, are more likely to lead to language learning than implicit strategies, such as repetitions or recasts, because they unambiguously signal to the child the inappropriateness of their language choice. Overall, the choice of appropriate language intervention strategies and techniques used by parents passing on their home language to children is an important research issue requiring further investigation.

Few language maintenance studies discuss the use of digital technologies for home language transmission. Szécsi and Szilágyi (2012) focus on the use of Web-based technologies in Hungarian and describe the role of parents in selecting media in the community language and providing appropriate language support to their children. Based on a survey investigating language practices of schoolchildren in Sydney schools, Morgan and Peter (2014) report that

40% of the children used Facebook and 56% used their phone to text in a language other than English. Interestingly, the participating children emphasized the role of their mothers in encouraging them to use Web 2.0 technologies in the home language. Cho (2008) describes the role of Internet technologies in Korean language maintenance and transmission in Vancouver. The Korean families participating in the study provide their children with opportunities to read in Korean on the Internet. The parents and the children express the view that the Internet exposes them to a range of social roles and language registers. Currently, there is no research describing the interaction in the community language that occurs between parents and children during various activities involving modern technology, and the language transmission affordances created in such situations. Recognising the increasing presence of digital media technologies in family homes and the opportunities those technologies may provide as language transmission tools, the present study is an attempt to address this poorly researched area.

2. The Polish language in Australia

The present study concerns Polish, which is spoken by 50,696 people in Australian homes, although the number of people who declare Polish ancestry, and potentially use Polish in other interactional domains, is 170,335 (ABS 2011). In the first immigrant generation, Polish is maintained at the average rate in comparison with other community languages, but it is relatively poorly transferred onto the second generation. Consequently, Polish is among the languages that are leaving the Australian social scene (Clyne 2005; Debski 2009). The difficult situation of Polish in Australia contrasts with the growing number of Polish language speakers and learners in Europe and USA, resulting from Poland's joining the European Union in 2004, a change in the direction of the Polish emigration from intercontinental to intracontinental, and the elevation of the country's international standing as a major European democracy and economy (Dąbrowska, Miodunka, and Pawłowski 2012). Research of Polish as a community language in Australia spans several decades. Among the prominent themes found in the subject literature are: Polish language use, transmission and maintenance (Janik 1996; Leuner 2008; Debski 2009; Lipińska 2013), Polish language as a 'core value' (Smolicz 1981; Smolicz and Secombe 1981), Polish language and identity (Wierzbicka 2007), impact of new technologies on Polish language maintenance (Fitzgerald and Debski 2006; Debski 2009) and the phonology of English-Polish bilingual children (Sussex 1982; Debski 2015).

In order to arrest the gradual disappearance of Polish from the Australian society, efforts are made to strengthen its intergenerational transmission by raising awareness of the benefits of bilingualism among members of the Polish community, and educating them about language transmission strategies and techniques. In August-September 2015, the author conducted a series of seminars entitled 'What carers should know about bilingualism and raising children in more than one language', targeting Polish-speaking communities in four capital cities in Australia[2]. According to anecdotal evidence gathered during those seminars, Poland-born parents often delegate to their children the responsibility of documenting various family activities and publishing their reports using digital technologies. Some parents frame such family activities as an opportunity to transmit elements of the Polish language and culture. Informing the Polish community about the strategies of Polish language transmission that

[2] The seminars were supported financially the Polish Consulate General in Sydney.

they might use in the home environment and demonstrating their effectiveness is an important objective.

The present research analyses a family activity aimed at creating voice-annotated video documentaries in Polish by a school-aged girl learning Polish as a community language in Australia. During the girl's visit to Poland, her grandparents gave her a digital video camera with an encouragement to make films during family trips and send them back to Poland on DVD discs. While the girl's grandparents saw their request as a way of keeping in touch with the family, her parents regarded it also as a way to help their daughter improve her proficiency in Polish. In order to practise her spoken Polish the girl was encouraged to comment in Polish on what she was filming, and this way create her own voice annotations to the video footage. The video recordings were sent to Poland where they were viewed by the grandparents, other family members and their friends. The girl received positive feedback from her family in Poland about the videos and strong encouragement to continue her project.

The video documentary project generated numerous interactions between the child and her parents at the time of recording, which were captured in the videos. Those interactions are hypothesised in the present study to be conducive to community language learning, based on the premise that language competence is best developed in meaningful social interaction (Lantolf 2000; van Lier 2004), such as the context of a family project. The video camera used by the child in the study is regarded as a tool mediating the parent-child interaction and the language learning process. In sum, the objective of the present research was to study the video recordings in order to answer the following questions:

1. How did the focal child and her parents interact during the video recording activity? What patterns can be identified in their interactions?
2. What evidence of community language learning by the focal child can be found in the data?
3. What was the role of the camera as a tool mediating the videorecording activity and language learning?

3. The study

3.1. The focal child and her family

Agnieszka, the English-Polish bilingual child in this case study, is 10 years old at the start of her video documentary project and she is 13 at the time when she finishes it. She lives in a North-Eastern suburb of Melbourne with her parents and her sister who is 7 years older. Her parents were born and raised in Poland. Polish is their first language and their English is fluent. They have university education, good understanding of the benefits of bilingualism and are technology savvy. Agnieszka left Poland when she was 3 months old. Since then, she has visited Poland six times, together spending approximately 8 months there. Agnieszka's grandparents have visited Melbourne three times, each time significantly increasing the amount of interaction in Polish in Agnieszka's home environment. The girl speaks English, her stronger language, with her school friends, her older sister at home, and occasionally with her parents in the context of schoolwork, especially right after she returns from school. She uses Polish fairly consistently with her parents, grandparents, cousins, and with some of her parents' Polish friends.

3.2. The data and data analysis

The data in the study were seven voice-annotated video documentaries, 211 minutes long in total, made by the focal child. The data analysis consisted of repeated viewings of the video material. Initial analysis involved identification of all segments where the girl and her parents interact, and transcription of those segments using standard discourse analysis conventions (Liddicoat 2007) for further analysis.

Then the transcribed data were analysed again in order to identify excerpts providing information that would address the research questions. In this analytical process, several socio-cultural language learning concepts seemed relevant and provided the focus. The most general of those was the concept of mediation, and the concomitant concepts of collaborative interaction and tool mediation, which are crucial in our understanding of mediated language learning (Lantolf 2000). Our understanding of collaborative interaction in the present study was similar to the concept of collaborative dialogue, used in task-based second language learning to describe 'problem solving and, hence, knowledge-building dialogue' (Swain, 2000, 113). Also important was the notion of learning in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky 1978), and especially Ohta's (2000) interactional strategies, i.e. strategies used by language learners, such as specific intonation contours, to bid for assistance from their interlocutor when they work in the ZPD. The notion of learner agency in second language learning is complex and has many definitions that align it with the cognate concepts of authenticity, authorship and/or identity. Two of those definitions were particularly useful for the present study. A broad definition by Ahearn (2001, 112) describes agency as 'the socioculturally mediated capacity to act'. In her discussion of the concept of authorship in digital media, an area close to the subject matter of this study, Murray (1997, 126) defines agency as 'the power to take meaningful action and to see the results of our decisions and choices'. Finally, the focus of the data analysis was on the use of the video camera by the bilingual child as a tool mediating her activity. The concept of 'anchoring', defined by van Lier (2004, 66) as 'the tying of language to the world', seemed particularly useful. It was hypothesised that the camera facilitated 'anchoring' and therefore the indicational process of learning.

On many occasions during the analysis, it was necessary to go back to the raw video data in order to select other extracts, re-interpret the selected extracts in a broader interactional context or refine the transcriptions. The strongest patterns and illustrative data excerpts were then selected for presentation.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Collaborative interactions

Preliminary overview of the video documentaries made by the focal child revealed numerous instances of verbal interaction between the girl and her parents who either witnessed her video recording activity or participated in it. It quickly became evident that those contingent interactions, mainly intended to support the girl's documenting project, also had a secondary focus on the child's language, that is on the fluency, structural accuracy and situational/factual relevance of her annotations produced in Polish. Further analysis and

attention to fine conversational detail allowed to notice that both the focal child and those who surrounded her used identifiable strategies promoting their interactions. Those collaborative interactions concerned different levels of the language system.

Analysis of several transcript excerpts will help us understand the dynamics of those collaborative interactions. In excerpt (1) below, Agnieszka (A.) and her father (F.) co-construct a sentence, as they walk through a small canyon in the mountains.

(1) [Hiking in the Grampians, Australia]

1	A:	*Idziemy:: (1.0) uhm (0.5)*
		We're walking:: (1.0) uhm (0.5)
2	F:	*przez miejsce ¿*
		through a place ¿
3	A:	*przez miejsce:*
		through a place
4	F:	*które ¿*
		which ¿
5	A:	*które się nazywa (0.5) 'Silent street' (0.5) więc (0.2) 'Cicha::*
		which is called (0.5) 'Silent street' (0.5) so (0.2) 'Cicha::
6	F:	*ul[i::* str[ee::
7	A:	*[uliczka (1.0) OK.* [street (1.0) OK

After A. pushes the record button on her video camera, she says in Polish '*Idziemy*', elongating the final semivowel and searching for what to say next (line 1). This behaviour prompts F. to start providing assistance with the continuation of the story. From now on, A. and F. take turns, each turn being a step towards completing the sentence. In lines 2 and 4, F. uses rising intonation to encourage A. to continue. In line 5, A. attempts to translate the English name of the canyon ('Silent street') into Polish, but she forgets the Polish word for 'street'. She translates the first part of the name ('*Cicha*'), elongating the final vowel in the word. F. again interprets A.'s verbal behaviour as bidding for help and provides a prompt in the form of the first two syllables of the word *uliczka* (street) A. has difficulty recalling (line 6). A. immediately comes up with the correct word without waiting for her father to finish saying the word, and closes the sequence with an OK that marks her satisfaction (line 7).

The video recording activity pushes the child to use various techniques in order to solicit assistance from her parents, so that she can continue constructing her voice annotations. In excerpt (1) we could see how she used prosodic and non-lexical features to bid for help, such as final sound elongation and the vocalisation 'uhm' that marks searching for a word or information. As occasionally seen in the recordings, she also checks the correctness of her oral production by asking explicit questions. In excerpt (2) she asks her mother (M) if she remembers correctly that 'midnight mass' is *pasterka* in Polish.

(2) [Gradparents' house, Poland]

8	A:	*Dzisiaj pójdziemy wieczorem na pas (.) na pasterkę? (.) Tak się mówi mamusiu?*
		This evening we will go to the mid (.) midnight mass? (.) Is that how you say it Mum?
9	M:	*Tak tak*
		Yes yes

When Agnieszka does not know how to continue her story or whether what she is saying has factual accuracy, she actively searches around for information, as illustrated in excerpt (3). During a trip to Kamakura that she is documenting, she does not know where she and her family are (line 10), but she quickly obtains the information she needs from her parents. Sometime later, she says to the camera that they are in the *Hase-kano* chapel (line 11).

(3) [Kamakura, Japan]

10A: *Nie wiem dokładnie gdzie jesteśmy ale (.) wchodzimy (0.5) ale dowiem się niedługo (0.6)*
I don't exactly know where we are but (.) we're going in (0.5) but I'll find out soon (0.6)
Więc gdzie jesteśmy?
So where are we?

((a few minutes later))

11A: *Jesteśmy w świątyni i nazywa się 'Hase-kano'*
We're in a chapel and it is called 'Hase-kano'

Excerpt (4) provides yet another example of a collaborative interaction. This time the girl and her mother are exploring the vicinity of the Keyo University campus. The girl has her camera switched on, she is filming and describing various elements of the landscape. When her mother comes up to a little shrine, the girl wants to say it, but she does not know the Polish word for 'shrine'. She remembers the first syllable of the word though, so she says it, elongating the final vowel, as she often does when she needs assistance (line 12). Realising that her mother is too far away to hear her subtle request for lexical assistance, she asks loudly an explicit question (line 12). Her mother provides the word *kapliczka* (line 13), but the girl cannot hear it properly and says to the camera, somewhat tentatively, a similar-sounding (rhyming) word that she knows ('*tabliczka*', Eng. 'tablet') (line 14). The girl's mother, knowing that the word *kapliczka* may be new and difficult for her daughter, provides a simple definition of the target word (line 15) without waiting for the girl to finish what she is saying. The girl repeats the definition and it gets recorded (line 16). This analysis demonstrates that the collaborative interactions between the girl and her parents not always were fully successful. In excerpt (4), the girl does not learn the word *kapliczka* in the end, and she may even have it mixed up with the word *tabliczka* (Eng. 'tablet'). However, she probably forms a pathway in her mind between the physical appearance of the object (*kapliczka*), the definition provided by her mother (lines 15-16), and the context where the object can be experienced.

(4) [Keyo University, Japan]

12 A: *Tutaj mamusia stoi (0.5) przy takie:j (0.3) ka:: (.) JAK SIĘ NAZYWA?*
Here Mum is standing (0.5) near so:me (0.3) shr:: (.) WHAT IS IT CALLED?
13 M: *KAPLICZKA*
SHRINE
14 A: *Tablicz[ka* Tablet ((ENG translation, but not rhyming))
15 M: *[TAKIE MIEJSCE DO MODLENIA SIĘ*
A KIND OF PLACE FOR PRAYING
16 A: *Miejsce do modlenia się*
A place for praying

Agnieszka's parents respond to her daughter's bidding for help in a number of ways. The excerpts discussed thus far show that they provide words, phrases, factual information, and prompts in the form of the first syllables or a definition of a word the girl is looking for.

Other examples found in the dataset show that they also provided inflectional endings, the Polish equivalents of English words or phrases that the girl used or they confirmed the correctness of her linguistic choices. The parents also initiated collaborative interactions and provide what might be called 'unsolicited assistance'. They spontaneously corrected the girl's errors, mainly inflectional and lexical, and stimulated her output by directing her attention to objects and actions around her, either verbally or by pointing. It seems that they remained aware of Agnieszka's video recording project and purposefully generated stories when they were near her that the girl could appropriate and use in her documentaries.

4.2. Evidence of language learning

Two factors seem crucial in making Agnieszka's video recording project a successful language transmission activity. The first and most important is its meaningfulness to the girl and relevance to the rest of the family. There is strong evidence in the video recordings that the girl remains adamant in her determination to make the videos informative and enjoyable for her grandparents in Poland. As they do not speak English, she knows that the films must have a Polish language voiceover and she is very careful not to use any English at all. In excerpt (5) below, while talking about the family's plans for the evening, her father uses the English pronunciation for the word 'rummikub' (line 17). The girl immediately corrects her father and says the same word with a Polish pronunciation (line 18), anticipating that otherwise her grandparents might not understand it. A similar attention to the voiceover being exclusively in Polish is evident in excerpt (1) discussed earlier. There, the girl translates 'Silent street', the name of the canyon where she and her family are, into the Polish equivalent *Cicha uliczka,* although names are often left in their original form in translations.

(5) [A hotel room in Falls Creek, Australia]

17 F: *A później w* <u>*rummikub*</u> /'rʌmɪkʌb/ *będziemy (.) jak zwykle (.) grali* ((ENG pronunciation))
And later, as always, we will play rummikub
18 A: *Tak (.) w* <u>*rummikub*</u> /ru'mikup/ <u>((POL pronunciation))</u>
Yes, rummikub

Secondly, the transcripts demonstrate that, throughout the video recording project, Agnieszka is pushed to perform above her current language level, working in the ZPD created by her parents. In excerpt (6), A. wants to say that she and her parents are in an old prison's gunpowder storage room, but she does not know the genitive (GEN) form of the noun *prochownia* (Eng. 'gunpowder storage room') that she had heard and learnt a while earlier. She engages her father (line 19) who provides the correct form of the word '*prochowni*'(line 20). The girl says the word *prochowni* to the camera, and then, *sotto voce* and clearly not for the recording, she repeats its basic nominative (NOM) form that she learned earlier (line 21). Thus the girl demonstrates that she pays attention to the grammatical endings and wants to memorise the two forms of the Polish noun, using what resembles a rote learning technique.

(6) [An old prison in the Flinders Ranges, Australia]

19 A: *Jesteśmy w środku:: (0.5)*
We are in the middle:: (0.5)
20 F: *prochowni*
gunpowder.storage.room+GEN+SG
of a gunpowder storage room
21 A: *prochowni (0.3) dobra (0.5) prochownia* ((quietly, not for recording))
gunpowder.storage.room+GEN+SG good gunpowder.storage.room+NOM+SG
of a gunpowder storage room (0.3) Good (0.5) A gunpowder storage room.

The transcripts also contain more direct evidence of internalisation of various elements of the target community language during the video recording project. This is most evident when the girl re-uses the words or phrases that she has learnt. In excerpt (7), while A. is filming the Falls Creek skiing village, she notices a heavy vehicle transporting tourists. She does not know how to say what it is in Polish, so she uses the word *czołg* (Eng. 'tank') that she knows from watching Polish war movies, denoting an object that resembles the vehicle that she is looking at (line 22). Her mother immediately provides the word *taksówka śnieżna* (Eng. 'snow taxi') (line 23). A few minutes later, when there is another snow taxi coming their way, her mother, tongue in cheek, says '*A tu czołg jedzie'* (Eng. *'*And here is a tank coming') (line 26). The girl laughs, says the correct word and then, in a playful tone, repeats the wrong word that she had used earlier to signal to her mother that she understands her mistake (line 27).

(7) [The Falls Creek skiing village, Australia]

22 A: *Tutaj jest taki czołg*
Here is some tank.
23 M: *<u>Taksówka śnieżna</u>*
A snow taxi
24 F: Village shuttle
25 A: *Takimi jeździmy (.) jeżdżą (0.5) OK*
We drive those (.) they drive (0.5) OK

((a few minutes later))
26 M: *A tu czołg jedzie*
And here is a tank coming.
27 A: *Haha (.) To jest <u>taksówka śnieżna</u> (.) albo czołg (.) Haha.*
Haha (.) This is a snow taxi (.) or a tank (.) Haha

There is evidence in the video recordings that the girl learns new language items and then re-uses them later, e.g., the following day. While the family are in the Grampians, the girl does not know how to express concepts such as 'to hike', 'hiking', 'mountain hike', etc. in Polish. We can see her hesitation how to express it on their first day in the mountains, when she says to the camera: '*Jutro jedziemy w górę (0.3) w góry (0.3) nie (.) w górę (0.5) na spacer'* (Eng. 'Tomorrow we will go up (0.3) to the mountains (0.3) no (.) up (0.5) on a walk'). In fact, when the family return from a hike in the mountains the following day, she explicitly asks her mother to help her to express it (excerpt 8, line 28). M. provides the phrase ('*z wycieczki w góry*') (Eng. 'from a mountain hike') (line 29) and A. repeats it in her story (line 30). The following day, she records the same expression *wycieczka w góry* (Eng. 'hike in the mountains'), but with the preposition *na* (Eng. 'on') that requires the accusative (ACC) case,

without any assistance (line 33). A few hours later that day she uses the expression again in her recording prompted by her mother (line 36).

(8) [Hiking in the Grampians, Australia]

28 A: *Wróciliśmy z:: uhm (0.5) Jak się nazywa?*
We have returned fro::m uhm (0.5) How do you call it?
29 M: *Z wycieczki w góry*
from hike+GEN+SG in mountains
From a hike in the mountains
30 A: *No właśnie (0.5) z wycieczki w góry (0.5) I (.) jeszcze raz (0.2)*
That's it (0.5) from a hike in the mountains (0.5) and (.) once again (0.2)
31 F: *jemy*
we eat
32 A: *jemy*
we eat

((the following day))

33 A: *Znowu dzisiaj (.) idziemy na wycieczkę (0.5) w góry (.) i idziemy do takich (.) wodospadów*
Again today we.go on hike+ACC in mountains and we.go to some waterfalls
Today again (.) we're going on a hike (0.5) to the mountains (.) and we're going to some (.) waterfalls

((a few hours later))

34 A: *Wróciliśmy z:: (0.5)*
We came back fro::m (0.5)
35 M: *No::*
Yes::
36 A: *z wycieczki w góry (0.3) jeszcze raz*
from hike+GEN+SG in mountains more once
from a hike in the mountains (0.3) once again

The transcripts contain several more direct examples of the girl's learning – at the morphological, lexical or phrasal levels – similar to the ones shown in excerpts (6), (7) and (8).

4.3. Video camera mediation

The video camera plays an important role in the analysed language transmission activity. Firstly, it is a tool that helps engage Agnieszka in creative and socially meaningful actions which drive the girl's linguistic work, such as learning new inflectional endings, new lexical items, and obtaining increased fluency in using the community language. Arguably, the child is responsive to her parents' explicit corrections, metalinguistic feedback and even mild admonitions, because she sees those interventions through the prism of her own determination to make her video project factually accurate and linguistically correct. Therefore, the distinction between explicit and implicit feedback (Lanza 2005; Kheirkhah and Cekaite 2015) clearly loses its sharpness in the context of the girl's goal-oriented and meaningful activity, as the girl seems to respond favourably regardless of the type of feedback.

Secondly, the camera allows the girl to frame and freeze objects and actions around her in order to comment on them and to engage her parents. Time and again, various actions and objects become the focal points of shared attention and subjects of collaborative negotiations. The following segment of a video recording made in a Tokyo hotel room (excerpt 9) demonstrates this. Agnieszka wakes up and decides to film the bedroom. This is the first time she can have a good look around the room, as she and her parents had arrived late at night.

(9) [A Tokyo hotel, Japan]

37 A: *Yuji (0.3) tatusia::*
Yuji (0.3) dad's::
38 F: *kole[ga*
friend
39 A: *[kolega (.) wczoraj nas (.) od stacji kolejowej (0.2)*
friend yesterday us from railway.station
40 F: *odebrał*
picked up
41 A: *odebrał i kupił nam (.) jedzenie i (.) nie picie (0.5) nie (.) tylko picie*
picked up and bought us (.) food and (.) no drinks (0.5) No (.) just drinks
42 M: *tylko picie (.) Kupił nam piwo: ¿*
just the drinks (.) He bought us beer: ¿
43 A: *piwo*
beer
44 M: *wodę ¿*
water
45 A: *wodę (0.3) i sok (.) pomarańczowy*
water (0.3) and orange (.) juice
46 F: *A zupy sami (.)*
and soup ourselves
47 A: *A zupy sami kupiliśmy. Tylko nie mogliśmy nic przeczytać (.) więc nie wiemy (.) z czym ta zupa jest*
And the soup we bought ourselves. But we couldn‘t read anything (.) so we don't know (.) what the soup is made of

She starts recording a story about their arrival the night before, supported by the father (lines 37-40). Then she zooms in on some objects on the table in front of her and says that their Japanese friend picked them up and bought them some food and drinks. Then she pauses and corrects herself that he only bought some drinks (line 41). The girl's mother joins in and confirms that their Japanese friend only bought them some drinks, and starts naming the objects on the table (line 42). From then on, M., F. and A. say in Polish the names of the objects in front of them and the girl films them (lines 43-46). It seems that the zoom function of the video camera creates a unique opportunity for the parents and the girl to focus their joint attention on objects and name them in Polish.

5. Conclusion

In summary, the family project analysed in the present study proved to be a successful community language transmission activity. The analysis of the video documentaries demonstrated that, while the focal girl was recording her videos, she routinely engaged with her parents in collaborative interactions, aimed at supporting the progress of the project and

ensuring that her voiceovers were correct, linguistically and content-wise. A number of patterns emerged from the analysis of those interactions. To bid for assistance from her parents, the child used a range of interactional strategies, such as: 1) elongating the final sound of a word, 2) saying the first syllable of a word and elongating the final sound, 3) using the vocalisation *uhm* to mark uncertainty/searching for information, 4) asking explicit questions to check the correctness of her oral productions and 5) asking for factual information. Those interactional moves were more varied, but overall resembled the bids for help used by adult foreign language learners in task-based activities (Ohta 2000). The parents responded to those moves by confirming the correctness of the girl's annotations and providing inflectional endings, words, phrases and factual information. They also used prompts, such as the first syllable/s or a definition of the lexical item the child was looking for. The micro-analysis of the transcripts also revealed numerous examples of spontaneous 'unsolicited assistance' provided by the parents, such as: 1) correcting the child errors (mainly inflectional and lexical), 2) directing her attention to various objects and actions taking place around them, either verbally or by pointing, and 3) telling stories that the child might re-cycle in her voiceovers.

The analysis of the transcripts provided evidence that the video documentaries family project created an environment conducive to language transmission as well as specific examples of community language internalisation. It demonstrated quite convincingly that the girl was very active and she used the collaborative interactions as a linguistic resource to take control over the shape of her documentaries and her voice annotations. In fact, the analysis showed a high level of the child's motivation to work in order to create texts that were exclusively in Polish and factually and linguistically correct. It is proposed that the high motivation of the child was fuelled by her 'taking meaningful action' (Murray 1997, 126), i.e. creating texts in the target language with relevance to a real-life audience. The agency evident in the child's behaviour also resulted in her compliance with explicit parental feedback. As a tool enabling the girl to produce texts that she could share with an authentic audience, the video camera was instrumental in supporting her agency.

The transcripts provided evidence that the collaborative interactions between the focal child and her parents allowed the girl to perform above her current language proficiency level, working in the ZPD. Specific evidence of language learning was found in the transcripts, demonstrating that the girl negotiated the correctness of some language units with her parents and then used them correctly in texts that she produced later. Occasionally, she even signalled to her parents that she understood her errors and learned successfully. The parents of school-aged children have few if any opportunities to engage their children in interaction where objects or actions become the centre of their joint attention and can lead to indicational language learning. It seems that the video camera facilitated such learning – which van Lier (2004, 66) named 'anchoring' or 'tying of language to the world' – resembling collaborative pointing and naming used by parents with children who are much younger than the girl in the present study.

References

Ahearn, Laura M. 2001. "Language and Agency." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (1): 109–137. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2011. *Census of population and housing*. Canberra.

Cho, Sunah Park. 2008. "Korean immigrants' social practice of heritage language acquisition and maintenance through technology." PhD Diss., University of British Columbia. https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0066473.

CILT/InterAct International. 2007. *Effects on the European Union economy of shortages of foreign language skills in enterprise (ELAN)*. http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/elan_en.pdf.

Clyne, Michael. 2005. *Australia's language potential.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael. 1991. *Community languages: The Australian experience.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael, Yvette Slaughter, John Hajek, and Doris Schupbach. 2015. "On the relation between linguistic and social factors in migrant language contact." In *Language structure and environment: Social, cultural, and natural factors*, edited by Rik De Busser and Randy J. LaPolla, 149-175. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Clyne, Michael, and Sandra Kipp. 2002. "Australia's changing demography." *People and Place* 10 (3): 29-35.

Corsellis, Ann. 2005. "Training interpreters to work in the public services." In *Training for the new* millennium, edited by Martha Tennant. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dąbrowska, Anna, Władysław Miodunka, and Adam Pawłowski. 2012. *Wyzwania polskiej polityki językowej za granicą: Kontekst, cele, środki i grupy odbiorcze.* Warszawa. https://www.msz.gov.pl/resource/be481e2d-6140-47b6-a32a-38b84c25ca0d:JCR.

Debski, Robert. 2015. "Phonological patterns in the speech of English-Polish bilingual children in Australia: Initial findings." *LingVaria* 20 (2): 27-40.

Debski, Robert. 2009. *Dwujęzyczność angielsko-polska w Australii: Języki mniejszościowe w dobie informatyzacji i globalizacji.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Doucet, Jacques. 1991. "First generation Serbo-Croatian speakers in Queensland: Language maintenance and language shift." In *Language in Australia*, edited by Suzanne Romaine, 270-284. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Döpke, Susanne. 1992. *One parent, one language: An interactional approach.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Enstice, Emily McCormick. 2012. "Perceptions of bilingualism and home language maintenance and loss: A study of Latino parents at a San Francisco Bay Area Elementary Charter School." PhD Diss., University of San Francisco. http://repository.usfca.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=diss.

Fitzgerald, Michael, and Robert Debski. 2006. "Internet use of Polish Melbournians: Implications for maintenance and teaching," *Language Learning and Technology* 10(1): 87-109.

Fogle, Lyn Wright, and Kendall A. King. 2013. “Child agency and language policy in transnational families.” *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 19: 1–25.

Gibbons, John and Elizabeth Ramirez. 2004. *Maintaining a minority language: A case study of Hispanic teenagers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gyogi, Eiko. 2015. “Children’s agency in language choice: A case study of two Japanese-English bilingual children in London.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18 (6): 749–764. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.956043.

Janik Janusz. 1996. “Polish language maintenance of Polish students at Princess Hill Saturday School in Melbourne,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17(1): 3-15.

Kheirkhah, Mina and Asta Cekaite. 2015. “Language maintenance in a multilingual family: Informal heritage language lessons in parent-child interactions.” *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 34 (3): 319-346.

Kouzmin, Ludmilla. 1988. “Language use and language maintenance in two Russian communities in Australia.” In *The future of ethnic languages in Australia. (International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 72), edited by Anne Pauwels, 51-65. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lambert, Brigitte E. 2008. *Family language transmission: Actors, issues, outcomes.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lantolf, James P. ed. 2000. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lanza, Elizabeth. 2004. *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leuner, Beata. 2008. *Migration, multiculturalism and language maintenance in Australia.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.

Lipińska, Ewa. 2013. *Polskość w Australii. O dwujęzyczności, edukacji i problemach adaptacyjnych Polonii na antypodach.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Morgan, Liam, and Maria G. Peter. 2014. “Affordances for home language maintenance created by multimodal Web 2.0 and mobile technologies.” In *International Conference on Information Communication Technologies in Education 2014 Proceedings*. http://www.icicte.org/Proceedings2014/Papers%202014/5.3%20Morgan.pdf.

Murray, Janet H. 1997. *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The future of narrative in cyberspace.* Cambridge, UK, MA: MIT Press.

Ohta, A.S. 2000. “Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar.” In *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, edited by James P. Lantolf, 51-78. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poulin-Dubois, Diane, Agnes Blaye, Julie Coutya and Ellen Bialystok. 2011. “The effects of bilingualism on toddlers’ executive functioning.” *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology. 108* (3): 567-579.

Paradis, Johanne, Fred Genesee, and Martha B. Crago. 2011. *Dual language development and disorders: A handbook on bilingualism & second language learning*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Rubino, Antonia. 2009. “Language maintenance strategies and language attitudes of new migrants from Italy.” In *Studies in applied linguistics and language learning*, edited by Ahmar Mahbood and Caroline Lipovsky, 203–223. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Schwartz, Mila. 2010. “Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field.” *Applied Linguistics Review*: 171-192. doi:10.1515/9783110222654.171.

Smolicz Jerzy J. 1981. “Core values and ethnic identity.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4: 75-90.

Smolicz, Jerzy J., and Margaret J. Secombe. 1981. *The Australian school through children’s eyes: A Polish-Australian view.* Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Sussex, Roland. 1982. “The phonetic interference of Australian English in Australian Polish.” In *The Slavic languages in Emigre Communities*, edited by Roland Sussex, 141-153. Carbondale and Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc.

Swain, Merrill. 2000. “The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue.” In *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, edited by James P. Lantolf, 97-114. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szécsi, Tunde, and Janka Szilágyi. 2012. “Immigrant Hungarian families’ perceptions of new media technologies in the transmission of heritage language and culture.” *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 25 (3): 265-281.

van Lier, Leo. 2004. *The ecology and semiotics of language learning.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2007. “Two languages, two cultures, one (?) self: Between Polish and English.” In *Translating lives: Living with two languages and cultures*, edited by Mary Besemeres, 96-113. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Zhu, Hua. 2008. “Duelling languages, duelling values: Code-switching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 1799–1816. doi:10. 1016/j.pragma.2008.02.007.

Transcriptions conventions

<u>underscoring</u>	section highlighted for reader’s attention
?	‘question’ intonation
¿	rising intonation, but not reaching as high as the ‘question’ intonation

.	falling intonation
:	brief elongation of a sound
(.)	brief pause
(0.0)	length of pause
[	onset of an overlap
(( ))	commentary
CAPS	talk that is louder than the surrounding talk
NOM	nominative marker
GEN	genitive marker
ACC	accusative marker
ENG	English
POL	Polish